

Serial Number 10/632,050
Response Dated May 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action of February 18, 2005

Remarks

Claims 16-19 have been allowed. Claims 1-15 and 20-22 stand rejected. Claim 2 is cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of claim 2, claim 3 has been amended to depend from claim 1, and claims 20-22 have been amended. In view of the above amendments and remarks set forth below, reconsideration is respectfully requested. No new matter has been entered as a result of this response.

I. Examiner Interview on May 10, 2005:

A telephonic interview was conducted on May 10, 2005 between the undersigned, Donald Cox Reg. No. 37, 804 and Examiner Chervinsky in which a comparison of applicant's Figure 1 (showing a conventional configuration) was made to applicant's Figure 10 incorporating features of the present invention as set forth in claims 1, 2, 13 and 20 and relating to the meaning of the term "diode compartments". In addition, a comparison was made between applicant's Figure 1 and US Patent No. 5,424,594 to Saito et al. to point out the features of claims 1, 2, 13 and 20 were not found in patent 5,424,594.

Following the demonstration, claims 1, 2, 13 and 20 were discussed, applicant offered to amend claims 2 into independent form and 20 to more particular point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of applicants invention. Claim 1 was amended to include the features of claim 2 and claim 2 has been cancelled. Also, the term "electrically" was replaced with "physically" and "rectifier bridge assembly" was replaced with "heat sink" to more particularly set forth the structural relationship of the diode to the heat sink in claim 20. Claims 21 and 22 have also been amended to correct dependency from claim 20 and to conform with the language of amended claim 20. It is believed that agreement was reached on the features of claims 2 (now claim 1), 13

Serial Number 10/632,050
Response Dated May 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action of February 18, 2005

and 20 and that US Patent No. 6,528,911 to DePetris in combination with patent 5,424,594 did not disclose these features.

However, no agreement could be reached on the allowance of the claims, as the references listed in the IDS filed with applicant's response of January 6, 2005 had not yet been considered.

A review of US Patent No. 6,528,911 to DePetris in view of remarks in applicant's last response filed January 6, 2005 on pages 11 and 12 was made to reach a mutual understanding to the appropriateness or inappropriateness of combining the 6,528,911 patent with references using epoxy as that would defeat an intended purpose of the 6,528,911 patent. However, no agreement was reached.

II. Rejection of Claim 1 under 35 USC 102:

The rejection of claim 1 has been rendered moot, as claim 1 now stands as claim 2 in independent form.

III. Rejection of Claims 2-22 under 35 USC 103:

It is believed that the present rejection has been overcome in view of the mutual understandings reached in the interview of May 10, 2005.

Serial Number 10/632,050
Response Dated May 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action of February 18, 2005

IV. Summary:

Applicant believes that all the Examiner's rejections have been addressed and overcome. It is believed that none of the references, either alone, or in combination, anticipate or render obvious the invention claimed in claims 1, 3-22. Accordingly, allowance of the presently pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Kamran Fattahi
Kamran Fattahi
Attorney for Applicant
PTO Reg. No. 35,758

Law Offices of Kamran Fattahi
6345 Balboa Blvd Suite 330 (Bldg 2)
Encino, CA 91316